UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,716	07/25/2003	Kil-Soo Jung	1293.1761	9679

49455 7590 07/03/2008

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP
1400 EYE STREET, NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
RUTLEDGE, AMELIA L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	**Application No.** 10/626,716	**Applicant(s)** JUNG ET AL.	
	Examiner AMELIA RUTLEDGE	**Art Unit** 2176	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 17 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
   a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
   b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
   Claim(s) allowed: _____.
   Claim(s) objected to: _____.
   Claim(s) rejected: _____.
   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/*Doug Hutton*/
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments filed 06/17/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

While applicant argues in regard to Feature 1 (Remarks, p. 13-15), that Lamkin does not disclose the limitation of independent claim 1, ...a cookie generation command program, Lamkin discloses a cookie generation command program in Fig. 7, and at par. 0207, for example, which discloses that "General-purpose cookies are cookies that can be placed by web pages." Therefore Lamkin discloses " a markup document supporting an interactive function for reproducing the AV data and comprising a command program, the command program comprising a cookie generation command program." (See Remarks, p. 15-18).

Lamkin does teach a cookie generation command program, specifically, Lamkin teaches the playback of audio and/or video embedded within a web page (p. 4, par. 74) which contains a command program (p. 4, par. 84) to generate cookies (p. 11, par. 205-p. 12, par. 218). Lamkin teaches parsing the markup document and extracting the command programs by interpreting the markup structure, (p. 5, par. 86; p. 6, par. 107), which are included in the markup document.

Applicant argues regarding Feature 2 of claim 1, (see Remarks, p. 18-25), "a domain attribute identifying the interactive digital content reproducing apparatus as a domain ", it is the examiner's opinion that the combination of Lamkin and Montulli renders the limitation obvious, since Montulli teaches a method for transferring state information between a server and client computer using cookies (col. 7, l. 16-60). Montulli teaches that the cookie domain attribute can be set by the server system in order to retain state information, and that a domain name may define a subset of a domain, and may be set to any host name, such as "anvil.acme.com" and "shipping-crate.acme.com", which each fall within the "acme.com" domain (col. 8, l. 5-58; col. 5, l. 15-36). Montulli teaches that state information is tracked by matching the "name" "domain" and "path" attributes when a cookie is received (col. 9, . 37-col. 11, l. 46) and overwriting or changing the state information.

While applicant argues that by referring to In re Van Geuns, the examiner did not adequately respond to applicant's prior argument relying on whether the cookies are generated by a server to show that the combination of Lamkin and Montulli is non-obvious (Remarks, p. 21-22), the examiner respectfully disagrees, since a detailed motivation statement was provided to support the combination of Lamkin and Montulli, and since applicant's arguments to differentiate the disclosure of the references from the claim limitations were based on features not recited in the claims, i.e., whether or not the cookie domain attribute were set by a server.

In response to applicant's argument that setting a cookie to identify a server is different from setting a cookie to identify a device (Remarks, p. 23-26), it is the examiner's opinion that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, for the reasons of record, i.e., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the method of setting the domain attribute to track state information disclosed by Montulli to the method of playing back DVD and web content on a web page disclosed by Lamkin, because Lamkin teaches methods of using cookies to track content playback information, and Montulli teaches a method of setting cookie attributes to track state information; it would have been both obvious and desirable to identify the reproducing apparatus as a domain, since Montulli teaches a method of using the domain attribute to track general categories of state dependent information.

In response to applicant's arguments regarding dependent claim 8 (Remarks, p. 26-27), Lamkin clearly discloses a decoder decoding a read content, and a command program which operates to control the data storage unit by extracting predetermined target information (p. 7, par. 132-135; p. 12, par. 207-214), and commands the generated cookie information be stored in the data storage unit (p. 11, par. 205-206). Lamkin teaches that cookies contain information for playback mode, for example, and player state information (p. 12, par. 0212, 0221-0222). Lamkin discloses each and every limitation of claim 8, because Lamkin discloses components which perform the same functions claimed in claim 8.

In response to applicant's arguments in regard to claim 69 (Remarks, p. 29-30), Lamkin teaches wherein the system variable is a play state system variable of the interactive digital content reproducing apparatus (p. 7, par. 0129-0132; p. 14-33), because Lamkin teaches a play state system variable for media playback events. Lamkin also discloses a variable to track play state at (p. 7, par. 132-135; p. 12, par. 207-214), and discloses detailed method for tracking play state.

In response to applicant's arguments regarding claim 70 (Remarks, p. 31-33), Lamkin does disclose wherein the system variable is a parental level system variable of the interactive digital content reproducing apparatus (p. 67, C.1.10; p. 42; A.2.13). Lamkin discloses at p. 13, par. 256-257 that the system commands disclosed at p. 67, C.1.10; p. 42; A.2.13 are part of the system application program interface (API) and can be used by the HTML/javascript calling application. Lamkin teaches that the command handler, event generator, and identifier engine all interact with the cookie manager to pass information about the API to cookies (p. 7, par. 0128-0134), and therefore shows that the system commands are programmatically linked to the cookie manager.

For reasons of record, it is believed that the rejections of claims 52, 58, 67, 70, and the remaining dependent claims should be maintained, and applicant presents arguments substantially similar to those presented for independent claim 1 and dependent claim 8. .